1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7		ICTRICT COLUDT	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA		
9	ATTAC	OMA	
10	SCOTT C. SMITH,	CASE NO. 11-5080RJB/KLS	
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER ON REPORT AND	
12	V.	RECOMMENDATION	
13	WASHINGTON STATE DEDARTMENT		
14	WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,		
15	Defendant.		
16	This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of U.S.		
17			
18	Recommendation, objections, if any, and the record herein.		
19	The Report and Recommendation contains the fact and procedural history of this case		
20	(Dkt. 13, at 1-2) and is adopted here by reference. The first issue addressed in the Report and		
21	Recommendation is Defendant Washington State Department of Corrections' ("DOC") Motion		
22	to Dismiss (Dkt. 9). Dkt. 13. Rather than file a response to the Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiff filed		
23	an Amended Complaint without seeking leave of C	Court or the agreement of the opposing party.	
24	ıl		

1	Dkt. 10. The second issue addressed in the Report and Recommendation, then, is whether leave	
2	should be granted for Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint. Dkt. 10. The Report and	
3	Recommendation recommends dismissing the claim in the Complaint against DOC, and granting	
4	Plaintiff leave to amend.	
5	The Report and Recommendation's recommendation, that Plaintiff's claim against DOC	
6	should be dismissed, should be adopted for the following reason. Plaintiff's only claim in the	
7	original Complaint is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim for damages against the DOC. Dkt. 1. Plaintiff'	
8	§ 1983 claim is not a valid federal claim because "a state is not a 'person' against whom a § 1983	
9	claim for damages might be asserted." Lapides v. Board of Regents of University System of	
10	Georgia, 535 U.S. 613, 617 (2002)(holding that although no § 1983 claim could be maintained	
11	against Georgia, the state law claims could proceed because Georgia waived sovereign immunit	
12	by removing the action)(citing Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58 (1989)).	
13	Plaintiff's claim against DOC should be dismissed.	
14	To the extent that Plaintiff intended to move to amend his Complaint when he filed his	
15	Amended Complaint, the Report and Recommendation should be adopted and his motion to	
16	amend should be granted. It appears Plaintiff intends to amend his complaint by naming	
17	individual defendants. Dkt. 10. Plaintiff should be permitted to amend his Complaint, and use	
18	the pleading entitled Amended Complaint (Dkt. 10) as his Amended Complaint. Plaintiff is	
19	reminded, however, that he is expected to follow the Federal and Local Rules of Civil Procedure.	
20	It is ORDERED that:	
21	• The Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 13) is ADOPTED ,	
22	Plaintiff's claim against DOC is DISMISSED ,	
23	 Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend the Complaint is GRANTED, 	

24

The pleading entitled Amended Complaint (Dkt. 10) supersedes the original Complaint. The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to all counsel of record and to any party appearing pro se at said party's last known address. Dated this 11th day of April, 2011. ROBERT J. BRYAN United States District Judge